



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/800,312

03/12/2004

Juan Carlos Martinez

07781.0156-00

1750

22852

7590

05/22/2008

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

SHIU, HO T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,312	Applicant(s) MARTINEZ ET AL.	
	Examiner HO SHIU	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-49 are pending in this application. Claims 14 and 23-49 have been amended by amendment filed on 02/26/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-28, 30-40, 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (Pub # US 2002/0092004 A1, hereinafter Lee).**

4. With respect to claim 1, Lee discloses a computer-implemented method for automatically configuring a translation code, the method comprising the steps of:
translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the translation code ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8);
transmitting the translated data from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9);
transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message ([0036], lines 1-3); and

automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-7).

5. With respect to claim 2, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition message is automatically transmitted from the client to the server upon change of the data format within the client ([0036], lines 1-4, [0056], lines 15-19).

6. With respect to claim 3, Lee discloses wherein the translation code is adapted to the changed data format within a translation code generator upon receipt of the data object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4).

7. With respect to claim 4, Lee discloses wherein the translated data is transmitted from the server to the client using a standard object description language ([0039], lines 1-7).

8. With respect to claim 5, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).

9. With respect to claim 6, Lee discloses wherein the data format required by the client is extracted and translated from the stored data by the translation code prior to sending the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines

1-4).

10. With respect to claim 8, Lee discloses wherein the server provides a data object definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).

11. With respect to claim 9, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing access to the server by the data object definition messages via an authorization management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

12. With respect to claim 10, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing data formats of different clients via a version management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

13. With respect to claim 11, Lee discloses wherein, upon change of the data format, the server requests the data object definition message from the client and the client transmits the data object definition message upon request to the server ([0056], lines 1-4, lines 10-19).

14. With respect to claim 12, Lee discloses wherein the server automatically detects changes in the data format of data associated with the server (0056}, lines 17-19).

15. With respect to claim 13, Lee discloses The computer-implemented method of claim 12, wherein the changes in the data format are detected by version identification ([0056], lines 17-19).

16. With respect to claim 14, Lee discloses wherein the changes in the data format are detected during an exchange of data between the server and the client ([0057], lines 5-12).

17. With respect to claim 15, Lee discloses wherein the translation code is adapted to the changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the data object definition message ([0063], lines 1-10).

With respect to claim 16, Lee discloses wherein the translated data

18. is transmitted from the server to the client using a standard object description language ([0039], lines 1-7).

19. With respect to claim 17, Lee discloses wherein the data object definition message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).

20. With respect to claim 18, Lee discloses wherein the data required by the client is extracted and translated from the stored data by the translation code prior to sending

the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines 1-4).

21. With respect to claim 20, Lee discloses wherein the server provides a data object definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).

22. With respect to claim 21, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing access to the server by the data object definition messages via an authorization management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

23. With respect to claim 22, Lee discloses further comprising the step of managing data formats of different clients via a version management procedure ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

24. With respect to claim 23, Lee discloses a computer readable media embodying a program of instructions capable of automatically configuring a translation code, the program comprising instructions operable to cause the computer to perform the steps of:

translating data into a data format required by a client using a translation code within the server ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8);

transmitting the translated data from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9);

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server via a data object

definition message [0036], lines 1-3); and automatically adapting the translation code to

Art Unit: 2157

the changed data format upon the server's reception of the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-7).

25. With respect to claim 24, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to automatically transmit the data object definition message from the client to the server upon change of the data format within the client ([0036], lines 1-4, [0056], lines 15-19).

26. With respect to claim 25, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to adapt the translation code to the changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the data object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4).

27. With respect to claim 26, Lee wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the translated data from the server to the client using a standard object description language ([0039], lines 1-7).

28. With respect to claim 27, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the data object definition message from the client to the server using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).

29. With respect to claim 28, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to extract and translate, the data required by the client from the stored data prior to sending the translated data from the server to

the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [00036], lines 1-4).

30. With respect to claim 30, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to provide, via the server, a data object definition message format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0037], lines 10-14).

31. With respect to claim 31, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via an authorization management process, access to the server by the data object definition messages ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

32. With respect to claim 32, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via a version management procedure, data formats of different clients ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

33. With respect to claim 33, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer, upon change of the data format, to initiate a server request for the data object definition message from the client and to transmit the data object definition message upon request from the client to the server ([0056], lines 1-4, lines 10-19).

34. With respect to claim 34, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to automatically detect changes in the data format by the server ([0056], lines 17-19).

35. With respect to claim 35, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to detect the changes in the data format by use of a version identification procedure ([0056], lines 17-19).

36. With respect to claim 36, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to detect the changes in the data format during an exchange of data between the server and the client ([0057], lines 5-12).

37. With respect to claim 37, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to adapt the translation code to the changed data format within a translation code generator upon reception of the data object definition message ([0063], lines 1-10).

38. With respect to claim 38, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the translated data from the server to the client using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).

39. With respect to claim 39, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to transmit the data object definition message from the client to the server using a standard object description language ([0036], lines 15-19).

40. With respect to claim 40, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to extract and translate the data required by the client from the stored data, via a translation code procedure, prior to sending the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-8, [0036], lines 1-4).

41. With respect to claim 42, Lee discloses the program further comprising instructions operable to cause the computer to provide, via the server, a data object definition message format ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

42. With respect to claim 43, Lee discloses, wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via an authorization management procedure, access to the server by the data object definition messages ([00039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

43. With respect to claim 44, Lee discloses wherein the program further comprises instructions operable to cause the computer to manage, via a version management procedure, data formats of different clients ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072],

lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

44. With respect to claim 45, Lee discloses a computer system for automatically configuring a translation code, the system comprising:
a code generator ([0034], lines 1-2), associated with a server ([0034], lines 3-5), that provides the translation code ([0036], lines 1-4) and which includes a subcomponent that adapts the translation code automatically to a change of data format upon receipt of a data object definition message ([0036], lines 1-4); and a translating means, for translating data into a data format required by a client based on the translation code ([0036], lines 1-4, [0035], lines 3-8); and means for transmitting translated data and the change of data format with the data object definition message from the server to the client ([0039], lines 5-9, [0036], lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2157

45. With respect to claim 46, Lee discloses wherein the translating means extracts the information required by the client from the data prior to sending the translated data from the server to the client ([0035], lines 3-9, [0036], lines 1-4).

46. With respect to claim 47, Lee discloses further comprising a managing procedure that manages the data format of the data object definition message ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7).

47. With respect to claim 48, Lee discloses further comprising an access control procedure that controls access to the server by the data object definition messages ([0039], lines 1-5, [0066], lines 6-7, [0072], lines 8-10, lines 15-17).

48. With respect to claim 49, Lee discloses further comprising a detection procedure that automatically detects changes in the data format ([0036], lines 1-4, [0056], lines 15-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

49. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

50. Claims 7, 19, 29, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claims 1, 2, 11, 23, 24, 33 in view of Salter et al. (US Pub # 2004/0010753 A1, hereinafter Salter).

51. With respect to claim 7, Lee discloses the claimed invention except where the translation code uses XSL for translating the data into said the data format required by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses where the translation code uses XSL for translating the data into said the data format required by the client ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files to an html page.

52. With respect to claim 19, Lee discloses the claimed invention except where the translation code uses XSL for translating the data into the data format used by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses where the translation code uses XSL for translating the data into the data format used by the client ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of

Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files to an html page.

53. With respect to claim 29, Lee discloses the claimed invention except to use XSL in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses to use XSL in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client. ([0014], lines 2-10). \

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files to an html page.

54. With respect to claim 41, Lee discloses the claimed invention except to use XSL in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client.

In the same field of endeavor, Salter discloses to use XSL in the translation code for translating the data into the data format used by the client. ([0014], lines 2-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lee with the teachings of Salter in order to generate the data presentation file so it is able to display the XML files to an html page.

Response to Arguments

55. Applicant's arguments with regards to claims 1-49, filed 02/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

56. On page 15 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 23 and 45, applicants argue that Lee fails to mention "translating data within a server into a data format required by a client" as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because Lee discloses in [0036], "the design database file created by the design program is passed to the generator program where it is reformatted as an extensible markup language (XML) meta document" and in [0035], "a designer or an automated computer system uses the design program.....which is stored in the design database." The designer or an automated computer system (client) uses the design program which stores elements required by the designer in a design database. The design database file created by the design program is passed to the generator program where it is reformatted as an extensible markup language (XML) document. The designer requested a certain layout/format of the design file by using the GUI which is then reformatted by the generator in order store such design file.

57. On page 15 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 23 and 45, applicants argue that Lee fails to mention translating data within a server and that lee sends data to a server, it does not translate data within the server.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since claim 1 recites "translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the translation code". In Fig. 1, [0035], and [0036], Lee discloses reformatting the design database file by passing it onto a generator program. Hence the reformatting/translating is done within a (one) server.

58. On page 16 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 23 and 45, applicants argue that Lee fails to mention a data format required by the client, a data object definition.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since by definition of W3C, XML is a data object.

59. On page 16 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 23 and 45, applicants argue that Lee fails to mention automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of the data object definition message.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since [0039] and [0046] disclose that a designer sets attributes which includes a data type which is used in the design program. It also discloses upon receipt of a XML meta document, it goes through a series of validation routines. Once the system design data passes the validation routines, the generator program creates the validated design database file and a system installation program which is sent to the production user computer. Overall, the system recognizes the data format from the XML meta document that is

needed (data object definition) which was created from a data design file by the designer (client). In [0038], Lee describes that there are other database applications that use technologies such as Paradox, MS Access and MySQL. Therefore, it knows that there are different types of system it needs to account for hence the need for the attribute. Once the generator makes sure that the design data passes through validations, it creates the validated design file (adapting the translation code to the changed data format).

60. On page 16 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claim 2, applicants argue that Lee fails disclose "the data object definition message is automatically transmitted from the client to the server upon change of the data format within the client."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments since in [0035], Lee states "through a user-friendly graphic user interface, the design program prompts the designer for elements of the system design and stores those elements as a design database file which is stored in the design database." In [0036], Lee states "the design database file created by the design program is passed to the generator program where it is reformatted as XML meta document." The storing of the design database file comes from prompting the designer for specific elements, but before storing so, it goes through the generator to reformat such file to be stored. Hence, the XML (data object) created from the generator (client), is transmitted to the database (server) without

respect to any pre-existing conditions being met.

Conclusion

61. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

62. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS

05/20/2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157